November 2, 2016

		1
		1
UNITED STATES DISTRIC		
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF	TEXAS	
HOUSTON DIVISION	1	
CONN CREDIT I, LP,	)	
Plaintiff,	) Case No.	
VS.	)4:15-CV-03713	
SHERMAN ORIGINATOR III	)	
LLC,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION BRYAN FALIERO	ON OF	
	3	
New York, New Yor		
Wednesday, November 2,	2016	
Reported by:		
TAMI H. TAKAHASHI, RPR, CSR		E
		abbies
And the second s		

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

202-220-4158

www.hendersonlegalservices.com

99 A. You know, I asked -- so, that's where I found out --I believe that's where I found out 3 4 that the reason why they were coming to us is I believe we were the second place bidder in the first round. So, I asked him what has happened with the current bidder and he -and he told me that they were unable to fund, they may be unable to fund. 10 His very first call to me was not 11 definitive that they wanted to negotiate with 12 us; it was feeling me out. 13 Just to see if it would --0. 14 A. If we would still be interested. 15 And what was your reaction? Q. 16 A. My reaction is, "Yes, we are still 17 interested."

- 18 Q. Any particular reason why?
- 19 A. Because we liked our bid the first
- 20 time.
- Q. You had an expectation that you
- would meet that 10 to 15 percent NPV?
- 23 A. Correct.
- Q. And after you got off that phone
- 25 call, what did you do then?

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

November 2, 2016

```
105
          A.
               Right.
          Q.
               -- what you remember.
 3
               I remember him saying that they
          A.
 4
     were unable to fund.
5
          0.
               Was that meaningful to you at that
     time?
          A.
               Sure, yes.
               Why?
          Q.
               Why somebody doesn't honor their
10
     agreement matters, so the reason is
11
    meaningful.
12
               Who was the person -- who was the
          0.
13
     entity not honoring the agreement?
14
               I did not know at the time.
          A.
15
               Which party, the buyer or the
16
     seller?
17
          A.
               Oh, I knew Conn's was the seller.
18
     I did not know who the winning buyer was.
19
          Q.
               Okay, that -- I -- you answered
20
    very specifically and I appreciate that.
21
               All right. So, you are saying that
22
    the purchaser was not honoring the agreement
23
    and that was meaningful to you.
24
          Α.
               Yes.
25
          Q.
               And how did that -- how did that
```

- 1 impact your decision to continue with the bid
- when you learned that it was potentially an
- issue with their inability to fund?
- A. That had less of an impact on my
- pricing than would -- you know, their reasons
- 6 could -- could have --
- There could be a lot of reasons why
- 8 the original buyer didn't fund. The reason
- given that they were unable to, they didn't
- have the cash, is probably the least harmful
- 11 from my perspective.
- 12 Q. What do you mean on the spectrum of
- 13 harm? I don't understand what would be the
- 14 least harmful, what would be the most
- 15 harmful.
- 16 A. Yeah.
- What would be most harmful is if
- there was an actual problem with the loans
- being sold themselves. If that were the
- 20 case, I would absolutely not bid and not
- 21 purchase.
- 22 If it were that there were no
- 23 problems with the accounts but they didn't
- fund because they were very unhappy with the
- 25 performance, then that would probably cause

- me as a matter of caution to lower my bid.
- And then the least harmful is hey,
- 3 they just didn't have the money to fund, and
- 4 then that leaves my original analysis fairly
- 5 intact.
- Q. Is it your experience that
- 7 purchasers that are unhappy with the
- 8 performance of the fund do try to back out of
- 9 continued purchase of debt portfolio?
- MR. WRONSKI: Form and foundation.
- A. We have purchased over 7,000
- 12 consumer portfolios, many of which have
- 13 performed poorly from an investment
- 14 standpoint. We have never backed out of the
- 15 purchase contract.
- 16 BY MR. MONTGOMERY:
- 17 Q. Of the 7,000 that you're talking
- about, how many of them were the purchase of
- ongoing flow, if you know?
- A. Many of them. I don't know the
- 21 exact percentage.
- Q. When you say "many," like more than
- 23 half, an unappreciable minority? What --
- And I understand you don't know
- 25 specifics.

```
On the Conn's portfolio when we
    saw, based on the number of consumers that we
    actually got hold of, the percentage of them
    that were complaining, it was, you know,
    multiple times our historic norm both on
    like similar assets and our portfolio as a
    whole. We suspected something were
    significantly wrong with the accounts.
               We didn't know at the time that the
10
    balances were actually wrong -- that we found
11
    out later -- but we knew enough from the
12
    types of disputes that we were getting that
13
    something is materially wrong. And for us to
14
    continue to call every single consumer to get
15
    that list perfectly would be us willingly
16
    abusing the consumer, calling a consumer on a
17
    balance that they may or may not owe, which
18
    would get us in regulatory hot water.
19
              So, what point did you cease
20
    collections for all reasons?
21
              We ceased -- that should be with an
22
    e-mail document somewhere. I want to say
```

middle of November of 2014, but I don't know

the exact date. It might have been late

November.

23

24

- So, if there was a million dollars
- worth of accounts we purchased, bankruptcy
- 3 accounts carry a different value. We would
- 4 agree to a price and try to replace them with
- 5 like value.
- Q. Any other solution that you're
- 7 aware of?
- 8 A. Not that I recall.
- 9 Q. At what -- you testified earlier to
- 10 an actual problem with the balance of the
- 11 accounts. What were you referring to?
- 12 A. There's a list of disputes we
- 13 received from the consumers that ran the
- 14 gamut of "I paid Conn's directly," "This was
- 15 settled prior to our acquisition," "I
- 16 returned the merchandise and they didn't give
- 17 me a credit," "They're billing me for
- 18 insurance that I never signed up for" or
- 19 "Insurance was supposed to pay the claim, not
- 20 me." Those are the ones that I can remember
- off the top of my head.
- 22 That was enough in terms of
- 23 percentage of accounts that were disputing
- 24 that led us conclusively to believe if we
- 25 could continue to work these accounts, we

November 2, 2016

- would be abusing consumers and violating the
- 2 law.
- What we didn't know at the time is
- 4 that 60-plus percent of the balances are
- 5 admittedly wrong by Conn's for the lack of
- 6 crediting the unused premium of a warranty
- 7 agreement, so flat out the balances were
- 8 wrong. We didn't even uncover that problem,
- 9 but the nature of the complaints were so
- 10 filled with outrage that we stopped
- 11 collection activity, based on the list of
- 12 reasons I just gave.
- 13 Q. I'm sorry. When you mention the
- 14 nature of the complaints were so filled with
- outrage, are you talking about from the
- 16 individual debtors?
- A. From the consumers, yes.
- 18 Q. Then how was the level of outrage
- 19 relatively tracked by Resurgent?
- A. We listened to the calls. Every
- 21 call is recorded.
- Q. And how many calls were listened
- 23 to?
- A. I believe I sent over -- I don't
- 25 recall the exact number. I believe it was

- 1 otherwise?
- A. We did.
- MR. WRONSKI: Object to the form.
- A. We did have those conversations.
- Those conversations were relayed back through
- 6 Garnet to us that these types -- from Conn's,
- and I'm going paraphrase because I don't
- 8 remember the exact quote, but "These types of
- 9 consumers make all kind of excuses, you've
- just got to keep calling them," and we were
- not going to do that.
- 12 BY MR. MONTGOMERY:
- 13 Q. And the 256 examples that you sent
- in November of 2014, why those 256? Were
- 15 there more that you had within your -- that
- 16 you had compiled that you did not send?
- A. That was everything we compiled at
- 18 that time.
- 19 Q. So, you were making these decisions
- 20 based on that universe of 256 accounts that
- 21 were transmitted to Conn's in November of
- 22 2014?
- A. That was a subset of the accounts I
- 24 was making a determination on that got us
- 25 very, very uncomfortable.

```
1
               So, the population I was referring
    to are the population of accounts where we
    actually contacted the consumer.
    consumers we contacted, 256 of them disputed
    or complained. So, I looked at that ratio,
    number of disputes or complaints in the
    numerator, total number of consumers we
    contacted in the denominator, and that
    dispute rate was up around 7 percent.
10
              And I think we covered earlier that
11
    historically that dispute rate should be half
12
    of 1 percent, so that's roughly 14 times the
13
    normal dispute rate.
14
              And if you couple that with the
15
    nature of their dispute, they weren't just
16
    validating, you know, why we reported it to
17
    the credit bureau because we hadn't yet.
18
    They weren't validating "I don't know who you
19
           They were saying things like "I
20
    returned my furniture, they never gave me
21
    credit," "My product was defective," "This
22
    part of the balance I never signed up for."
23
    Their disputes all --
24
              The majority of their disputes
25
    spoke to the integrity of the balance, and
```

- the volume of disputes made it unworkable.
- 2 And for us to do that, we would have been
- setting us up for serious regulatory
- 4 repercussions through any type of
- examination, in our opinion, from a state AG
- 6 or a federal regulator.
- 7 MR. MONTGOMERY: And object to the
- 8 nonresponsive portion.
- 9 BY MR. MONTGOMERY:
- 10 Q. Really my question was beyond the
- 11 256 disputes that you transmitted in November
- of 2014; were there any other disputes that
- 13 you did not transmit or were holding back for
- 14 any reason?
- A. No, we didn't cherry-pick the
- 16 disputes. That was everything that disputed
- once we stopped working them.
- I think today we ran it again and
- we might have been up to like 300. So, there
- was an incremental trailing of disputes that
- we would be happy to share that the nature of
- 22 the disputes has not changed.
- MR. WRONSKI: And I will point out
- and say for record, because you tried to
- 25 squeeze a nonresponsive objection there,

November 2, 2016

259

- Sherman is claiming Conn's failed to fulfill.
- 2 And we have the representations
- 3 articulated in the PSA. Besides those
- 4 representations, are there any others that
- 5 you would refer to, any other representations
- 6 made by any representative of Conn's to
- 7 Sherman even after the contract was executed
- 8 that you feel it failed -- that Conn's failed
- 9 to fulfill?
- A. So, there's a couple of things.
- On the points in media and the
- 12 e-mails that you already pointed out where we
- summarize we didn't get this media or get
- 14 that media, I don't know if that all shook
- out, so I don't know if they continued not to
- 16 kind of fulfill that.
- During the process I asked a direct
- 18 question, what happened --
- 19 I wasn't the original winner of
- 20 that portfolio, so when it came back to me --
- 21 and we already discussed that -- my first
- question is: What happened to the original
- 23 buyer? The answer I got -- and I got it from
- Garnet, I don't know if it came on behalf of
- 25 Conn's or it was Garnet's doing, but the

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

- answer was that the original buyer couldn't
- fund, didn't have the money. There were
- 3 bigger problems there that weren't disclosed
- 4 to me.
- So, I don't know if that falls into
- 6 your question in terms of what other
- mischaracterizations do I feel were made by
- 8 Conn's that aren't tied to the contract. But
- 9 why the first buyer fell through, where
- 10 Conn's knew there were problems with the
- accounts and the answer that we were told is
- 12 the original buyer just didn't have the
- money, I feel like that's a misrepresentation
- 14 if that's what you're asking.
- Q. Any other representation by Conn's
- 16 along those lines of post-contractual
- 17 representations between Conn's and Sherman?
- MR. WRONSKI: I'm just going to
- object. What he just testified about
- was pre-contractual.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that was.
- MR. MONTGOMERY: Oh, yeah, I'm
- 23 sorry. You're right. I apologize.
- A. I can't think of any but I don't --
- 25 I don't know what I might be missing. I

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.